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Title: Comparison of Single and Two-Tunnel Techniques during Open Treatment of Acromioclavicular Joint Disruption: a Retrospective study

Dr. Cyril Mauffrey,
Revisions were made to the manuscript and the responses to the individual concerns of each reviewer are reported below.
Thank you.

Zhiyong Hou, MD

Reviewer: David Hak
Reviewer's report:
This is a well written manuscript with a clear objective and findings. It is limited by the small size and non-retrospective nature which is identified in the discussion. I would support publication following minor essential revisions.

1. Would re-word the sentence, “In the physical evaluation, ROM, pain, weakness, satisfaction with the outcome of the surgery, and complications were recorded.”
To read, “In the physical evaluation, ROM, pain and weakness were evaluated. In addition satisfaction with the outcome of the surgery and complications were recorded.”

Thanks, I changed into “In the physical evaluation, ROM, pain, weakness, and complications were recorded.

2. Please identify when patients satisfaction was evaluated. You indicate that their satisfaction was recorded twice and it is hard to understand what is the difference between these two assessments. How is the outcome of their surgery different from their overall post-operative result? Are these the same or do they address different time points?
“In the physical evaluation, ROM, pain, weakness, satisfaction with the outcome of the surgery, and complications were recorded. Finally, patients were asked their overall satisfaction with the postoperative result...”

I changed into “In the physical evaluation, ROM, pain, weakness, and complications were recorded. Finally, patients were asked their overall satisfaction with the postoperative result, with 0 points for dissatisfaction or unsure and 2 points for satisfaction.”

3. Would change wording of your conclusion from, “In conclusion, anatomical reduction the AC joint and biomechanical reconstruction CC ligaments are crucial for the optimal joint stability and function. Two tunnel CC reconstruction with an allogenic ST graft provides satisfactory radiographic and clinical results compared to single-tunnel reconstruction technique.”
To, “In conclusion, anatomical reduction the AC joint and biomechanical
reconstruction CC ligaments are crucial for the optimal joint stability and function. Two tunnel CC reconstruction with an allogenic ST graft provides superior radiographic and clinical results compared to single-tunnel reconstruction technique.

Thanks, Changed.

Reviewer: Benoit Herbert
Reviewer's report:
Minor essential revisions:
- I would specify that the study design was "2 consecutives series" and if it was single or multi-center

Thank you. It is a single center study. “Between June 2003 and January 2009, twenty-three patients underwent open operation for AC joint reconstruction with ST allograft at our institution. In the earlier study period before 2007, we mostly used single-tunnel technique, and after 2007 mostly the two-tunnel technique.”

- You need to explain how the UCLA scale was obtain: was it through chart review or collected prospectively? Were the patients re-evaluated at the time of the study?
- Why using a modified UCLA scale?

The study is retrospective study and the UCLA scale was obtain through chart review. Regarding the data of our medical records, it just meets the need of the modified UCLA scale, so we used it.

- Reference number 5 do not seems to be accurate
Thank you, I rechecked it.